



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/044,484	01/11/2002	Larry C. Frame	020375-007400US	9883

20350 7590 01/10/2007
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER

LE, DEBBIE M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2168

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/10/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/044,484

Applicant(s)

FRAME ET AL.

Examiner

DEBBIE M. LE

Art Unit

2168

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 October 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Applicant's arguments filed on 10/24/06. Claims 1-23 are pending for examination.

With respect amendments to claims 1, 10 and 18, claim objection to claims 1, 10, and 18 has been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Boothby (7,013,315 B1).

As per claim 1, Boothby disclose a method for extracting related information from electronic files, wherein each file includes a plurality of records and wherein each record includes at least one field for containing data (col. 1, lines 46-50, col. 2, lines 23-28), the method comprising:

in response to a user input that designates at least one field as a key segment (as based upon the user choose whether the synchronizer should use the default field mapping for the two databases during synchronization or the user will modify the field mapping (i.e., user designates field(s) to be mapped) (col. 5, lines 49-54), **wherein a key segment comprises a field having pre-populated data and wherein the key segment field is common to each of a plurality of the records** (field and record of database have different characteristics, col. 1, lines 46-50), **comparing data contained in the key segment of each record of a first file to data in a related key segment of each record of a second file** (as comparing field of records of a first database corresponding field of record of the second database, col. 2, lines 30-39);

b) upon each occurrence of a match of data in the key segment of a record in the first file to data in the related key segment of a record in the second file (as strong match, weak match, col. 12, lines 63-65, col. 14, lines 34-49), **creating a record in a temporary electronic file** (as all CIGs are built, col. 14, line 50), **wherein the record in the temporary file includes at least one field and wherein that at least**

one field includes a copy of the matching data from the first and second files (col. 14, lines 56-67, col. 15, lines 1-19);

selecting data from the temporary file (as user's selection record from the records should be synchronized, col. 15, lines 20-55); and

outputting the selected data (as all conflicting fields are displayed in tabular, col. 16, lines 1-17).

As per claim 2, Boothby teaches deleting the temporary file (col. 17, lines 40-43).

As per claim 3, Boothby teaches for additional files, repeating steps a), b) and c) using an additional file as the first file and the temporary file as the second file (col. 18, lines 18-54).

As per claim 4, Boothby teaches wherein the first file is stored in electronic form on magnetic tape (Fig. 2, data from database or diskette, col. 3, lines 17-18).

As per claim 5, Boothby teaches wherein the first file is stored in electronic form on media selected from a group consisting of solid state memory, magnetic disk memory, and optical memory (Fig. 2, database records).

As per claim 6, Boothby teaches sorting the records of the first file based on data contained in the key (Fig. 2, indexing)

As per claim 7, Boothby teaches wherein a record of the temporary file created upon a match of data between records in the first and second files contains less than all of the data from the matching records of the first and second files (matches or conflict data records (col. 16, lines 1-13).

As per claim 8, Boothby teaches selecting data from the records of the temporary file based in part on logic operators (as logic comparison, col. 9, lines 30-54).

As per claim 9, Boothby teaches wherein the logic operators are selected from a group consisting of less than, greater than, equal to, not-equal-to, less-than-or-equal-to, greater-than-or-equal-to, in and not in (displayed only strong matched is equivalent to "equal-to", col. 12, lines 64-65).

Claims 10, 18 are rejected under the same rationale as stated in independent claim 1 arguments.

Claims 11-17, 19-23 have similar limitations as claims 2-9; therefore, they are rejected under the same subject matter.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 10/24/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Boothby's CIGs contains three files, each of two databases and a history file while Applicant's claimed that a temporary file contains reproduce a single copy of matching data from the first and second files.

With respect to Applicant arguments, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Boothby discloses that the synchronizer creates a workspace to load of A-database and B-database records for synchronization process (col. 5, lines 6-10). Based upon the user choose whether the synchronizer should use the default field mapping for the two databases during synchronization or the user will modify the field mapping (i.e., user

Art Unit: 2168

designates field(s) to be mapped) (col. 5, lines 49-54), then the synchronizer performs the conflict analysis and resolution on the records in the workspace (col. 5, lines 20-21). Thus, when comparing two records or two fields from the A-database and B-database (col. 9, lines 30-31), a matching record are produced and stored in CIG (col. 14, lines 50-51) as well as the history file is also created and stored in the CIG (col. 5, lines 27-28). It is noted that the claim 1 calls for "the at least one field includes a copy of the matching data from the first and second files". Applicant claims that the temporary file contains a copy of a matching data record from the first and second files which includes at least one field, but it is not clear that this temporary file contains the only single copy of matching data from the first and second files as argued by Applicant. Accordingly, the CIG contains matched records when comparing the two databases and the history file does read on the claimed language "the at least one field includes a copy of the matching data from the first and second files".

Conclusion

The prior art made of record, listed on form PTO-892, and not relied upon, if any, is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Bloedorn (US Patent No. 7,076,485 B2): Method and System for finding similar records in a mixed free-text and structured data.


THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DEBBIE M. LE whose telephone number is (571) 272-4111. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tim Vo can be reached on (571) 272-3642. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



DEBBIE LE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
12/28/06